

# Accepted Manuscript

A primary care web-based intervention modelling experiment replicated behaviour changes seen in earlier paper-based experiment

Shaun Treweek, Jill J. Francis, Debbie Bonetti, Karen Barnett, Martin P. Eccles, Jemma Hudson, Claire Jones, Nigel B. Pitts, Ian W. Ricketts, Frank Sullivan, Mark Weal, Graeme MacLennan

PII: S0895-4356(16)30233-5

DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.07.008)

Reference: JCE 9213

To appear in: *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*


Received Date: 1 February 2016

Revised Date: 21 June 2016

Accepted Date: 18 July 2016

Please cite this article as: Treweek S, Francis JJ, Bonetti D, Barnett K, Eccles MP, Hudson J, Jones C, Pitts NB, Ricketts IW, Sullivan F, Weal M, MacLennan G, A primary care web-based intervention modelling experiment replicated behaviour changes seen in earlier paper-based experiment, *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* (2016), doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.07.008.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



# **A primary care web-based intervention modelling experiment replicated behaviour changes seen in earlier paper-based experiment**

## **Authors**

Shaun Treweek<sup>1</sup>, Jill J Francis<sup>2</sup>, Debbie Bonetti<sup>3</sup>, Karen Barnett<sup>4</sup>, Martin P Eccles<sup>5</sup>, Jemma Hudson<sup>1</sup>, Claire Jones<sup>6</sup>, Nigel B Pitts<sup>7</sup>, Ian W Ricketts<sup>8</sup>, Frank Sullivan<sup>9</sup>, Mark Weal<sup>10</sup>, Graeme MacLennan<sup>1</sup>

## **Addresses**

1. Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, Health Sciences Building, Foresterhill, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, UK.
2. School of Health Sciences, City University London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK.
3. School of Dentistry, University of Dundee, Frankland Building, Dundee DD1 4HN, UK.
4. Centre for Population Health Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Medical Quad, Teviot Place, Edinburgh, EH8 9AG, UK.
5. Retired but at Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Baddiley Clark Building, Richardson Road, Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 4AX, UK when the work was done.
6. Health Informatics Centre, University of Dundee, Ninewells Hospital & Medical School, Dundee DD1 9SY, UK.
7. Centre for Dental Innovation & Translation, Kings College London, Guy's Hospital, London SE1 9RT, UK.
8. Retired but contactable via Computing, University of Dundee, Queen Mother Building, Dundee DD1 4HN, UK.
9. University of Toronto, Department of Community and Family Medicine, North York General Hospital, 4001 Leslie St. Toronto, ON M2K 1E1, Canada.
10. School of Electronics & Computer Science, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK.

**Corresponding author:**

Shaun Treweek

Health Services Research Unit

University of Aberdeen

3rd Floor, Health Sciences Building

Foresterhill

Aberdeen

AB25 2ZD

UK

Email: [streweek@mac.com](mailto:streweek@mac.com)

Mob: +44 777 901 6955

Fax: +44 1224 438165

## Abstract

**Objectives:** Intervention Modelling Experiment (IMEs) are a way of developing and testing behaviour change interventions prior to a trial. We aimed to test this methodology in a web-based IME that replicated the trial component of an earlier, paper-based IME.

**Study design and setting:** Three-arm, web-based randomised evaluation of two interventions (persuasive communication and action plan) and a 'no intervention' comparator. The interventions were designed to reduce the number of antibiotic prescriptions in the management of uncomplicated upper respiratory tract infection. General practitioners (GPs) were invited to complete an online questionnaire and eight clinical scenarios where an antibiotic might be considered.

**Results:** 129 GPs completed the questionnaire. GPs receiving the persuasive communication did not prescribe an antibiotic in 0.70 more scenarios (95% confidence interval = 0.17 to 1.24) than those in the control arm. For the action plan, GPs did not prescribe an antibiotic in 0.63 (95% CI = 0.11 to 1.15) more scenarios than those in the control arm. Unlike the earlier IME, behavioural intention was unaffected by the interventions; this may be due to a smaller sample size than intended.

**Conclusions:** A web-based IME largely replicated the findings of an earlier paper-based study, providing some grounds for confidence in the IME methodology.

**Keywords:** intervention modelling experiments, behaviour change, randomised controlled trials, prescribing, primary care

**Word count:** 2703

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

## **What's new?**

### **Key findings**

- A web-based Intervention Modelling Experiment (IME) replicated the findings of an earlier paper-based IME on general practitioners' simulated antibiotic prescribing behavior. The web-based IME did not replicate findings linked to behavioural intention.
- Intervention effects were consistent across different modes of intervention delivery.

### **What this adds to what is known**

- Replication studies are relatively rare. Using different modes of delivery, general practitioners from a different part of the UK and done seven years after the original study, this replication experiment demonstrated that the IME methodology can produce consistent results.

### **What is the implication?**

- The IME methodology may potentially be considered as a way of developing theory-based behaviour change interventions prior to evaluation in a full-scale trial.

## Background

Without help, the uptake of research results into clinical practice happens slowly, if it happens at all [1]. The field of *implementation science* (or *knowledge translation* as it is generally called in North America) has been established to, among other things, develop and evaluate interventions to support professional behaviour change that translates research evidence into practice. Examples include audit and feedback [2] and educational outreach [3]. However, the literature provides less information to guide the choice, or to optimise the components, of these interventions for use in different contexts [4, 5]. Interventions can be effective (e.g. reminder systems, audit) but the evidence is conflicting and the reason for this is largely unknown [2]. The UK Medical Research Council (MRC) framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions proposes more and better theoretical and exploratory work prior to a full-scale trial as a means of improving intervention development [6].

Intervention modelling experiments (IMEs) are one way of doing this exploratory work [7] with some of the present study's authors (DB, MPE, JJF and NBP) involved in their development. In an IME key elements of the intervention are delivered, using a randomised design, in a manner that approximates the real world but where the measured outcome is generally an interim outcome, a proxy for the behaviour of interest. Although we thought the methodology promising, there had been no replication study, which we considered essential if other investigators were to have confidence in the methodology; a single success is rarely sufficiently compelling to support widespread adoption [8].

The work described here is part of a study to evaluate the IME methodology itself by replicating an earlier, paper-based IME [9-11]. Our key research interests were:

1. Does the delivery mode of the IME (paper or web) affect predictors of GP behaviour?
2. Do interventions developed using these predictors change behavioural intention and simulated behaviour in similar ways for the paper and web-based IMEs?

This is important information because, for the IME methodology to be useful, it needs to be a robust and reliable method to support trialists with their intervention modelling work. The first aim was addressed in an earlier publication [12], which showed that the web-based IME identified 8/10 of the predictors of prescribing behaviour identified in the paper-based IME. This paper describes work linked to the second of our aims.

A detailed description of the form and content of the two theory-based interventions has been published elsewhere [12]. This paper describes a randomised evaluation of two behaviour change interventions (a persuasive communication and an action plan) with a 'no intervention' comparator, all of which were delivered within a web-based IME.

## Methods

The trial was a three-arm, web-based trial of two behaviour change interventions compared to no intervention. Participants were general practitioners (GPs) from 12



Scottish Health Boards identified by the Scottish Primary Care Research Network (SPCRN; [www.sspc.ac.uk/](http://www.sspc.ac.uk/)) using a combination of publicly available information provided by Information Services Division (ISD) Scotland (<http://www.isdscotland.org/isd/3793.html>) and restricted information held on the NHS.net database, the latter to provide e-mail addresses. SPCRN staff sent email invitations to GPs on our behalf because supporting recruitment to research studies in this way is part of their role and GPs were familiar with receiving emails from SPCRN (but not the research team). SPCRN staff also sent reminders but had no other role in the study. The decision to use email to invite GPs was taken after a randomised evaluation of postal versus email invitations, which found emails to be as effective as postal invitations but quicker and cheaper to send [13].

### *Recruitment*

Recruitment was done in two stages, reflecting the stages of an IME [8]. The first stage recruited GPs to complete an online questionnaire comprising 20 questions about antibiotic prescribing behaviour, eight clinical scenarios that required antibiotic prescribing decisions and four general questions about the GP's background. GPs were also offered a £20 voucher for this stage. These data were used to identify predictors of antibiotic-prescribing behaviour, which replicated work from the earlier paper-based IME [10], as well as to design a new intervention [12]. The clinical content of all eight scenarios, provided by one of the authors (MPE), was such that there were no clear cases for prescribing an antibiotic.

The second stage recruited from among the GPs responding to stage 1 but excluded those in the first quartile of responses to the questionnaire's 'intention to not prescribe antibiotics' questions. GPs already following best evidence for prescribing antibiotics were not candidates for our interventions. The remaining 75% of GPs were invited to complete a second online questionnaire, which this time included one of the two interventions or the 'no intervention' comparator. GPs were offered a £30 voucher for this stage (meaning a GP entering both stages was offered a total of £50 in vouchers). The eight scenarios in the second questionnaire were different to those in the first but again, they were created (by MPE) so that there was no compelling case in any of them for prescribing an antibiotic. The other 24 questions were the same as in the first questionnaire. The full questionnaire is shown in Additional File 1.

GPs were randomly allocated to one of the interventions or the comparator by the LifeGuide software (<https://www.lifeguideonline.org>), which we used to deliver the web-based IME. Non-responders received two reminders spaced two weeks apart. All research staff were blinded to GP recruitment allocation until the study database was locked.

### *Sample size*

Using the dependent variable of behavioural intention, we sought to detect an effect size of 0.66, which was the mean effect size for change in intention in a meta-analysis of trials that measured change in intention and behaviour [14]. We needed 50 participants per group to have 90% power of detecting this effect size at a significance level of 5%, or 150 participants in total. The recruitment target

was set at 250 GPs to achieve the sample size of 150 participants. This increase was to allow for drop-out between questionnaires and excluding the first quartile of responses to the 'intention not to prescribe antibiotics' questions (see above).

### *Interventions*

Two behaviour change interventions were evaluated: a *persuasive communication* and an *action plan*. The persuasive communication addressed beliefs about the consequences (e.g. including 'attitude' from the Theory of Planned Behaviour [15] and 'outcome expectancies' from Social Cognitive Theory [16, 17]) of managing patients with uncomplicated URTI without prescribing antibiotics. It was effective in reducing the number of antibiotic prescriptions in the paper-based IME's prescribing scenarios [11]. The format of this intervention can be translated entirely for web delivery, therefore repeating it in the current study would address questions about both intervention effectiveness and the relative effectiveness of paper versus web-based delivery of intervention materials. (See Additional File 2).

The action plan was a new intervention developed using data from the first online questionnaire [12]. Based on the stage 1 questionnaire responses, predictors of antibiotic-prescribing behaviour were identified and classified into 'theoretical domains' of behaviour change. Three domains predicted prescribing rates and were thus identified as targets in the new intervention. These domains were beliefs about consequences, beliefs about capabilities and behavioural regulation. Replicable behaviour change techniques (intervention components) have been identified to target each of the domains [18]. A behaviour change technique known to influence the last two of these three domains is action planning. An action plan

is an explicit statement of where, when, and how a behaviour will be performed. Action plans are proposed to work by setting up environmental cues to remind an individual to perform the behaviour [19]. Furthermore, repeated performance of a behaviour in response to the cue increases the likelihood that a behaviour may become a habit. (See Additional File 3).

Finally, a 'no intervention' comparator was used, in other words the web-based IME presented nothing to the GP and moved straight to the questionnaire and scenarios.

#### *Outcome measures*

There were two outcomes for the trial:

1. *Behavioural intention* (primary outcome) - strength of motivation, or intention to perform the target behaviour (i.e. not prescribing an antibiotic).
2. *Behavioural simulation* (secondary outcome) - clinical decisions in the context of simulated clinical situations presented in the eight clinical scenarios.

Behavioural intention was measured using three questions from the questionnaire: Q16, Q17 and Q18. (See Additional Files 1 and 4). The intention score was computed by computing the mean of the responses (range of 1 to 7, with a higher score meaning a greater intention to not prescribe an antibiotic) on these three items.

Behavioural simulation was the total number of clinical scenarios out of eight where an antibiotic was not prescribed. KB, GM and ST each categorised all GPs' responses to each clinical scenario with regard to prescribing into a Yes (an antibiotic was prescribed) or a No (an antibiotic was not prescribed) and discussed any differences in categorisation to reach consensus. All decisions were made blinded to allocation and before the final analysis was started.

### *Statistical analysis*

Categorical data were described using numbers and percentages, continuous data using mean and standard deviation. The two outcomes were analysed using linear regression comparing action plan and persuasive communication with the 'no-intervention' comparator. The models were adjusted for baseline and the effect sizes presented along with 95% confidence intervals and p-values and analysed by intention to treat. Analysis was carried out using Stata 13 (StataCorp. 2013. Stata Statistical Software: Release 13. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP).

## **Results**

Recruitment ran between February 2012 and August 2012 and a total of 198 GPs were randomised (Figure 1). Of these, 129 were from the lower three quartiles of the 'intention to not prescribe antibiotics' responses in the first stage, i.e. our target group, and all 129 sets of these data were analysed.

### *Equivalence of groups*

The demographic characteristics of the participants across the three trial arms were similar (Table 1).

### *Behavioural intention and behavioural simulation*

The mean number of scenarios without a prescription was 5.0 (out of 8) for the persuasive communication, 4.9 for the action plan and 4.2 for the 'no intervention' comparator (Table 2). Figure 2 shows the distribution of scenarios without an antibiotic prescription for the interventions and comparator.

The results of the regression analysis for behavioural simulation are also summarised in Table 2. Adjusted for baseline score, GPs receiving the persuasive communication did not prescribe an antibiotic in 0.70 (95% confidence interval = 0.17 to 1.24) more scenarios than those in the control arm. For the action plan intervention, GPs did not prescribe an antibiotic in 0.63 (95% CI = 0.11 to 1.15) more scenarios than those in the control arm.

Behavioural intention was unaffected by both interventions (Table 2). Correlation between intention and behavioural simulation was 0.13, indicating a weak relationship between the two.

## **Discussion**

The work described here is part of a study to evaluate the IME methodology itself by replicating an earlier, paper-based IME [10, 11] and describes a randomised evaluation of two interventions - a persuasive communication used in the paper-

based IME and an action plan developed from the predictors described in our earlier publication [12] - against a 'no intervention' comparator. To be reassured, we would have expected the persuasive communication intervention to reduce intention to prescribe an antibiotic and to reduce antibiotic prescribing in simulated clinical scenarios. For the persuasive communication, we would also expect the size of effect seen in the current work to be similar to that seen in the earlier, paper-based IME.

Both interventions increased the number of scenarios without an antibiotic prescription, as in the earlier study. The results seen in the current study for the persuasive communication are in broad agreement with those obtained for the same intervention in the paper-based IME (paper-based IME: increase of 0.47 (95% CI=0.19 to 0.74) scenarios without a prescription; web-based IME: increase of 0.70 (0.17 to 1.24) without a prescription. However, neither intervention reduced the intention to prescribe, although both sets of confidence intervals shown in Table 2 for behavioural intention do not rule out a reduction. However, we would not necessarily expect the action planning intervention to influence behavioural intention, as the proposed mechanism by which action plans change behaviour is similar to the mechanism involved in habit formation; that is, the behaviour is triggered directly by the context, with minimal reasoning or 'cognitive processing' [20]. Hence, following action planning, behaviour could change without the involvement of behavioural intention (which is a cognitive process). Although the study was powered on behavioural intention as the primary outcome (because intention features in both theories on which the intervention was based), the data showed different patterns for intention and behavioural simulation scores. The

intention data showed likely ceiling effects at baseline (mean of around 6 on a scale of 1 to 7). Hence a further increase in intention scores as a result of the intervention was unlikely. Responses to the clinical scenarios displayed a more symmetrical distribution at baseline (mean of around 5 on a scale of 0 to 8), despite the fact that the clinical content of all scenarios presented no clear cases for prescribing an antibiotic. Hence, the difference in findings for intention and simulation were likely a function of the difference in distributions. It is plausible that participants would respond differently to these different measures: intention questions ask GPs to report what they would do in general, and are therefore subject to unintentional bias, whereas clinical scenarios present individual cases, each of which have specific factors that may influence the prescribing decision.

The study had three strengths: it replicates previous work, it used a randomised design and it had a theoretical rationale for selecting intervention components. The work described here, together with that in a sister paper [12] (where we found that the web-based IME identified 8/10 of the predictors of prescribing behaviour identified in the paper-based IME), have largely reproduced results obtained in an earlier, paper-based IME [10, 11], which reassures us that the IME methodology is robust. The randomised design is the best way of running an experiment to test the effectiveness of proposed interventions.

There are three limitations. The first is inherent in the IME methodology and is that clinical scenarios were used to provide behavioural simulation scores. This was discussed in our earlier publication [12] but, in summary, although strong



evidence of the external validity of clinical scenarios is limited, studies that have explored this have been favourable towards their use [21].

The second limitation is that only 129, not 150 of GPs from the first stage took part in the second stage. Hrisos and colleagues [11] managed to get 340 of 397 (86%) GPs to return a completed questionnaire in their paper-based IME. That we could only persuade 129 of the 254 invited (51%) to respond to the second questionnaire is unfortunate and may explain our wide confidence intervals and failure to replicate the reduction in intention to prescribe as seen in Hrisos et al's earlier work [11]. Both studies had three participants who effectively withdrew by entering the study but who did not go on to provide a response. It perhaps also highlights the ease with which people can ignore electronic invitations, surveys and questionnaires. The final limitation is less about the methodology and more to do with the interventions: both led to a modest mean of around 0.7 fewer scenarios without an antibiotic prescription. We might expect this to get smaller still if the interventions were used in the real world rather than the simulated world of the IME. There are clearly limits to the type of intervention that can be tested in an IME and it may be that while these interventions may have potentially useful effects, these effects are modest.

## **Conclusion**

We have replicated, in a web-based system, an IME delivered initially on paper and we found changes in behavioural simulation that are consistent with those found in the paper-based IME. We did not replicate the changes in behavioral intention seen in the paper-based work. We have also evaluated a new behaviour change intervention in a randomised trial and found that it changed behavioural simulation as expected based on its theory-based design. Replication studies are an important part of increasing value and reducing waste in research [8] and this replication study gives us greater confidence in the IME methodology than a single study.

## **Acknowledgements and funding**

We would like to thank the GPs who took part in this study. We would also like to thank Marie Pitkethly and Gail Morrison for their help and support in recruiting GPs to the study. WIME was funded by the Chief Scientist Office, grant number CZH/4/610. The Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, is core funded by the Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health Directorates.

## **Ethical approval**

WIME was approved by the Tayside Committee on Medical Research Ethics A, Research Ethics Committee reference 10/S1401/54 and received NHS Research

& Development approval from the 12 National Health Service (NHS) Health Boards involved.

The trial of which this study is part is registered: ClinicalTrials.gov number NCT01206738.

### **Authors' contributions**

All authors except JH contributed to the design of the study. KB did most of the day-to-day running of the study, with support from CJ and ST. GM and JH analysed the data and KB, GM, DB, JJF, JH and ST discussed the results. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results. ST was chief investigator of the study and wrote the first draft of the paper. All authors contributed to the final version. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

## References

1. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Lavis JN, Hill SJ, Squires JE. Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implementation science* 2012; 7:1.
2. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, O'Brien MA, Johansen M, Grimshaw J, Oxman AD. Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012, Issue 6. Art. No.: CD000259. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000259.pub3.
3. O'Brien MA, Rogers S, Jamtvedt G, Oxman AD, Odgaard-Jensen J, Kristoffersen DT, Forsetlund L, Bainbridge D, Freemantle N, Davis D, Haynes RB, Harvey E. Educational outreach visits: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2007, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD000409. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000409.pub2.
4. Walker AE, Grimshaw J, Johnston M, Pitts N, Steen N, Eccles M: PRIME – PRocess modelling in ImpleMEntation research: selecting a theoretical basis for interventions to change clinical practice. *BMC Health Services Research* 2003, 3:22.
5. Foy R, Eccles M, Jamtvedt G, Young J, Grimshaw J, Baker R: What do we know about how to do audit and feedback? *BMC Health Services Research* 2005, 5:50.
6. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1655.
7. Bonetti D, Eccles M, Johnston M, Steen N, Grimshaw J, Baker R, Walker A, Pitts N: Guiding the design and selection of interventions to influence the implementation of evidence-based practice: an experimental simulation of a complex intervention trial. *Social Science and Medicine* 2005; 60: 2135-2147.
8. Ioannidis JPA, Greenland S, Hlatky MA, Khoury MJ, Macleod MR, Moher D, Schulz KF, Tibshirani R. Increasing value and reducing waste in research design, conduct, and analysis. *Lancet* 2014; 11; 166–75.
9. Treweek S, Ricketts IW, Francis J, Eccles M, Bonetti D, Pitts NB, MacLennan G, Sullivan F, Jones C, Weal M, Barnett K. Developing and evaluating interventions to reduce inappropriate prescribing by general practitioners of antibiotics for upper respiratory tract infections: a

randomised controlled trial to compare paper-based and web-based modelling experiments.

Implementation Science 2011, 6:16.

10. Hrisos S, Eccles M, Johnston M, Francis J, Kaner EF, Steen N, et al. Developing the content of two behavioural interventions: Using theory-based interventions to promote GP management of upper respiratory tract infection without prescribing antibiotics #1. BMC Health Serv Res. 2008; 8:11.
11. Hrisos S, Eccles M, Johnston M, Francis J, Kaner EF, Steen N, Grimshaw J: An intervention modelling experiment to change GPs' intentions to implement evidence-based practice: using theory-based interventions to promote GP management of upper respiratory tract infection without prescribing antibiotics #2. BMC Health Services Research 2008, 8:10.
12. Treweek S, Bonetti D, MacLennan G, Barnett K, Eccles MP, Jones C, Pitts NB, Ricketts IW, Sullivan F, Weal M, Francis JJ. Paper-based and web-based intervention modeling experiments identified the same predictors of general practitioners' antibiotic-prescribing behavior. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 2014; 67: 296–304.
13. Treweek S, Barnett K, MacLennan G, Bonetti D, Eccles M, Francis JJ, Jones C, Pitts NB, Ricketts IW, Weal M, Sullivan F. E-mail invitations to general practitioners were as effective as postal invitations and were more efficient. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 2012; 65: 793–7.
14. Webb TL, Sheeran P. Does changing behavioural intention engender behaviour change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. Psychological Bulletin 2006; 132(2): 249-268.
15. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behaviour. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 1991;50:179-211.
16. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: the exercise of control. New York, NY: Freeman; 1997.
17. Bandura A. Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory. In: Norman P, Abraham C, Conner M, editors. Understanding and changing health behaviour: from health beliefs to self-regulation. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers; 2000: 299-339.
18. Michie S, Johnston M, Francis JJ, Hardeman W, Eccles MP. From theory to intervention: mapping theoretically derived behavioural determinants to behaviour change techniques. Applied Psychology: An International Review 2008, 57, 660-680.
19. Snijders FF. Towards a theory of intentional behaviour change: Plans, planning, and self-regulation. British Journal of Health Psychology 2009; 14(2): 261–273.
20. Lally P, Gardner B. Promoting habit formation. Health Psychology Review 2013, 7; S137-S158.

21. Peabody JW, Luck J, Glassman P, Jain S, Hansen J, Spell M, Lee M. Measuring the quality of physician practice by using clinical vignettes: a prospective validation study. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2004; 141: 771–80.

## Table and figure legends

**Table 1** Baseline characteristics.

**Table 2** Behavioural intention and behavioural simulation. For behavioural intention, the data presented are for the sum of four questionnaire items linked to intention (see main text for details). Higher scores reflect a stronger intention to not prescribe an antibiotic. For behavioural simulation, the data presented are for number of scenarios where GPs did not prescribe an antibiotic.

**Figure 1** Participant flow. Note: <sup>1</sup>This breaks down as 254 GPs from the first stage of the IME and 260 GPs who were not involved in the first stage. <sup>2</sup>Forty GPs were from the upper quartile group of the first stage responders and were unfortunately invited to participate in stage 2 due to an administrative error. The remaining 26 (of the 198) were GPs who were not in the first stage but who were invited because we were unsure that 150 target GPs would respond, which turned out to be correct. The analysis presented in this paper focuses on the 129 GPs from our target group and for whom we have baseline ‘intention to not prescribe antibiotics’ data.

**Figure 2** The distribution of the number of scenarios (out of 8) for which 129 GPs did not prescribe an antibiotic for the Persuasive communication, Action plan and ‘No intervention’ control.

**Table 1** Baseline characteristics.

|                 | <b>Persuasive<br/>communication N=40</b> | <b>Action plan N=47</b> | <b>No intervention N=42</b> |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Male            | 24 (60%)                                 | 23 (49%)                | 22 (52%)                    |
| GP Trainer      | 6 (15%)                                  | 9 (19%)                 | 10 (24%)                    |
| Years qualified | 22.3 (standard<br>deviation=8.2)         | 20.5 (SD=7.9)           | 20.0 (SD=7.1)               |

**Table 2** Behavioural simulation and behavioural intention and behavioural simulation. For behavioural intention, the data presented are for the sum of four questionnaire items linked to intention (see main text for details). Higher scores reflect a stronger intention to not prescribe an antibiotic. For behavioural simulation, the data presented are for number of scenarios


| Mean score (standard deviation)                            |  |                        |                            |  |   |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
|  | Persuasive communication group N=39 <sup>1</sup> | Action plan group N=47 | No intervention group N=42 | Persuasive communication Vs No intervention <sup>2</sup> | Action plan Vs No intervention <sup>1</sup> |
| <i>Behavioural intention</i>                               |  |                        |                            |  |   |
| Stage 1 (baseline: pre-intervention)                       | 6.0 (0.9)  | 6.0 (0.8)              | 5.9 (0.7)                  |  |   |
| Stage 2 (post-intervention/comparator)                     | 6.1 (0.6)  | 6.1 (0.8)              | 6.1 (0.7)                  | -0.06 (95% CI=-0.32 to 0.19) N.S.                        | -0.04 (95% CI=-0.29 to 0.20) N.S.           |
| Mean no. scenarios without antibiotic (standard deviation) |  |                        |                            |  |   |
|  | Persuasive communication group N=40              | Action plan group N=47 | No intervention group N=42 |  |   |
| <i>Behavioural simulation</i>                              |  |                        |                            |  |   |
| Stage 1 of IME   | 5.2 (0.7)  | 5.2 (0.8)              | 5.1 (0.8)                  |  |   |
| Stage 2 of IME   | 5.0 (1.4)  | 4.9 (1.5)              | 4.2 (1.1)                  | 0.70 (95% CI=0.17 to 1.24)*                              | 0.63 (95% CI=0.11 to 1.15)*                 |

\*P<0.05; N.S. = not significant.


<sup>1</sup>One participant randomised to the persuasive communication did not provide enough data to be included.

<sup>2</sup>Adjusted for baseline scores.





**Figure 1** Participant flow. Note: <sup>1</sup>This breaks down as 254 GPs from the first stage of the IME and 260 GPs who were not involved in the first stage. <sup>2</sup>Forty GPs were from the upper quartile group of the first stage responders and were unfortunately invited to participate in stage 2 due to an administrative error. The remaining 26 (of the 198) were GPs who were not in the first stage but who were invited because we were unsure that 150 target GPs would respond, which turned out to be correct. The analysis presented in this paper focuses on the 129 GPs from our target group and for whom we have baseline ‘intention to not prescribe antibiotics’ data.



**Figure 2** The distribution of the number of scenarios (out of 8) for which 129 GPs did not prescribe an antibiotic for the Persuasive communication, Action plan and 'No intervention' control.